



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,975	04/20/2001	Mark Buonanno	2705-0711	4882
73552 7590 06/25/2008				
Stolowitz Ford Cowger LLP				
621 SW Morrison St				
Suite 600				
Portland, OR 97205				
EXAMINER				
BORISSOV, IGOR N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,975

Applicant(s)

BUONANNO ET AL.

Examiner

Igor N. Borissov

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-27, 30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-27, 30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/3508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/06/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/28/2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Amendment received on is acknowledged and entered. Claims 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, 24, and 28-29 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 31 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-27, 30 and 31 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13, 14, 20, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The following limitations are not described in the specification:

Claim 13: "means for monitoring packetized workflow procurement process communications exchanged between the parties to determine whether final receipts are sent to indicate consummation of the manually completed transaction, and when the

manually completed transaction is not consummated, identify one or more exceptions responsible for disrupting consummation of the manually completed transaction”.

Claim 14: “means for generating, using the database and according to the business information, a ranked listing of the agents for intelligently distributing the generated notification; and means for distributing a notification to one or more of the agents intelligently according to the ranked listing to resolve the exceptions identified by monitoring the packetized workflow procurement process communications”.

Claim 20: “for providing an audit trail of the transacted business deal,”.

Claim 30: “means for determining whether the identified exceptions are a first flagged type that occurs when a sending application involved in the web-based collaboration session does not receive a confirmation within a predetermined time period, a second flagged type that occurs when either one or more networks for the parties are unable to transfer one or more of the packetized workflow procurement process communications, or a third flagged type that occurs when the packetized workflow procurement process communications include an out of bounds security parameter; generate the notification when the identified exceptions are one of the flagged types; and format the generated notification to indicated the determined flagged type.”

Claim 31: “means for comparing the determined flag type to the business information for ranking the agents for intelligent distribution of the generated notification.”

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 11, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites:

"establishing a voice communication session directly between the first buying party and the second selling party responsive to the matching, the voice communication session initially established between only the first buying party and the second selling party without any call center agents initially included in the voice communication session;

"establishing a web-based collaboration session between the first buying party and the second selling party through a mutual Uniform Resource Locator (URL) simultaneously while the voice communication is active and responsive to the matching, the web-based collaboration session initially established between only the first buying party and the second selling party without any call center agents initially included in the web-based collaboration session", which is confusing. It is not clear what the word initially refers to. Is it part of *establishing* step? The claim does not require "initially establishing a web-based collaboration session...". Accordingly it is not clear should this limitation be given patentable weight.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites several limitations including conditional statement "if". However, claim 1 does not provide any indication how method steps to be performed when "if" conditions are not met, thereby rendering the claim indefinite.

Same reasoning applied to the remaining claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17-21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elms et al. (US 2002/0072992) in view of Horstmann et al. (WO 99/03053) and further in view of Chack (US 6,438,599).

Elms et al. (Elms) teaches a computer-implemented method, system and computer-readable medium containing instructions for enabling a host to facilitate a transaction between a first party and a second party, comprising:

Independent Claims

As per claims 1, 11 and 18,

locating a first party (a buyer computer) and a second party (a vendor computer) [0020]; said buyer and vendor computers are configured to communicate via the Internet [0024]; said parties are matched according to the predetermined criteria (requests) [0021];

establishing a real-time chat between the buyer and the vendor; said real-time chat includes a spoken dialog between the parties (while the voice communication is active) [0070];

establishing a web-based collaboration session (a real-time chat) through a website utility [0020] between the buyer and the vendor; said real-time chat includes a spoken dialog between the parties (while the voice communication is active) [0070];

upon request, providing current market information of a business deal to said first party and said second party [0049]; [0051];

transacting a business deal between the buyer and the vendor [0013]; [0083]; [0084].

While Elms teaches that said method provides a Web-based utility that introduces a first party, e.g., a buyer, to a second party, e.g., vendor, and facilitates a transaction between the buyer and the vendor, and enables the buyer and vendor to engage in a dialogue with one another [0008]; [0009], Elms does not specifically teach that said transacting is conducted within the business-to-business exchange.

Horstmann et al. teaches a method and system for providing collaboration between entities over a network to perform a task, wherein said entities are business entities (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elms to include that said transacting is conducted

Art Unit: 3628

between one business entity and another business entity, or within the business-to-business exchange, as disclosed in Horstmann et al., because it would advantageously increase the application field of the Elms' invention, thereby potentially increase revenue.

Also, while Elms teaches that said web-based collaboration session/dialog between the buyer and the vendor includes text, audio and video communicated between the parties [0070], Elms does not specifically teach that said communications are conducted simultaneously.

Chack teaches a computer-implemented method, system and computer-readable medium containing instructions for establishing communication for conducting a transaction over the Internet, said system including transaction processing system 14, web server 16, and network 20 which can support multiple telephones and computers simultaneously (C. 5, L. 29-31), said method including establishing both an audible connection (via the PSTN) and a data connection (via the network) between the call initiator and the transaction processing system so that the call initiator can communicate verbally with an agent of the transaction processing system using the telephone while simultaneously retrieving visual information in the form of web pages (C. 6, L. 48-54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elms to include that said web-based collaboration session/dialog between the buyer and the vendor includes simultaneous communication of text, audio and video information between the parties, as disclosed in Chack, because it would advantageously permit the augmenting of a non-visual communication path with visual data or transactional data having a defined structure, as specifically stated in Chack (C. 1, L. 67 - C. 2. L. 11).

Also, Elms and Chack does not specifically teach that said first party comprises a plurality of business division; and that said transacting said business deal comprises transacting said business deal between at least one of the plurality of business divisions of the first party and the second party.

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that business entities may include a plurality of business divisions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elms and Chack to include that said first party comprises a plurality of business division; and that said transacting said business deal comprises transacting said business deal between at least one of the plurality of business divisions of the first party and the second party, because it would advantageously allow big business entities to participate in the transactions, thereby increasing the application field of the Elms and Chack system, thereby potentially increase revenue.

As per claim 9,
locating a first party (a buyer computer) and a second party (a vendor computer) [0020]; said buyer and vendor computers are configured to communicate via the Internet [0024];

establishing a real-time chat between the buyer and the vendor; said real-time chat includes a spoken dialog between the parties (while the voice communication is active) [0070];

establishing a web-based collaboration session (a real-time chat) through a website utility [0020] between the buyer and the vendor; said real-time chat includes a spoken dialog between the parties (while the voice communication is active) [0070];

providing current market information of a business deal to said first party and said second party [0049]; [0051];

transacting a business deal between the buyer and the vendor [0013]; [0083]; [0084], wherein the locating step includes instant messaging (real-time chat) [0070].

Elms does not specifically teach that said transacting is conducted within the business-to-business exchange.

However, Elms does teach that said method provides a Web-based utility that introduces a first party, e.g., a buyer, to a second party, e.g., vendor, and facilitates a transaction between the buyer and the vendor, and enables the buyer and vendor to engage in a dialogue with one another [0008]; [0009]. Furthermore, the method steps

disclosed in Elms are not affected by the fact who the engaging parties are, and would be performed the same regardless of the type of the exchange.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elms to include that said transacting is conducted between one business entity and another business entity, or within the business-to-business exchange, because it would advantageously increase the application field of the Elms' invention, thereby potentially increase revenue.

Also, while Elms teaches that said web-based collaboration session/dialog between the buyer and the vendor includes text, audio and video communicated between the parties [0070], Elms does not specifically teach that said communications are conducted simultaneously.

Chack teaches a computer-implemented method, system and computer-readable medium containing instructions for establishing communication for conducting a transaction over the Internet, said system including transaction processing system 14, web server 16, and network 20 which can support multiple telephones and computers simultaneously (C. 5, L. 29-31), said method including establishing both an audible connection (via the PSTN) and a data connection (via the network) between the call initiator and the transaction processing system so that the call initiator can communicate verbally with an agent of the transaction processing system using the telephone while simultaneously retrieving visual information in the form of web pages (C. 6, L. 48-54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elms to include that said web-based collaboration session/dialog between the buyer and the vendor includes simultaneous communication of text, audio and video information between the parties, as disclosed in Chack, because it would advantageously permit the augmenting of a non-visual communication path with visual data or transactional data having a defined structure, as specifically stated in Chack (C. 1, L. 67 - C. 2, L. 11).

Also, Elms and Chack does not specifically teach that said first party comprises a plurality of business division; and that said transacting said business deal comprises

transacting said business deal between at least one of the plurality of business divisions of the first party and the second party.

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known that business entities may include a plurality of business divisions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elms and Chack to include that said first party comprises a plurality of business division; and that said transacting said business deal comprises transacting said business deal between at least one of the plurality of business divisions of the first party and the second party, because it would advantageously allow big business entities to participate in the transactions, thereby increasing the application field of the Elms and Chack system, thereby potentially increase revenue.

Furthermore, Elms teaches:

Dependent Claims

As per claims 2, 12 and 19,
automatically completing a computer-to-computer transaction once the buyer's and the vendor's criteria are met [0020]; [0027].

As per claims 3, 13 and 20,
manually completing a transaction between the buyer and the vendor through the collaboration session [0030]; [0070].

As per claims 4, 14 and 21,
a call center agent facilitating a transaction between the buyer and the vendor upon request [0030].

As per claims 7, 17 and 24, Elms teaches said method and system, comprising the step of utilizing a proactive agent (middlemen) to contact either the first party or the second party to complete a transaction when predetermined criteria for a prospective transaction is met [0030]; [0040]; [0041]; [0051].

As per claim 8, said method and system, wherein the locating step includes seek-and-find technology [0020].

As per claim 10, providing complete record of the correspondence between the parties and transaction signature [0069]; [0065]; wherein the correspondence includes the real-time chat by way of a spoken dialog between the parties [0070].

As per claims 28-31, see reasoning applied to independent claims.

Claims 5-6, 15-16, 22-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elms et al. in view of Horstmann et al. further in view of Chack and further in view of Walker et al. (US 2002/0169626).

Dependent Claims

As per claims 5, 15 and 22, Elms teaches providing complete record of the correspondence between the parties and transaction signature [0069]; [0065]; wherein the correspondence includes the real-time chat over the Internet by way of a spoken dialog between the parties [0070] and further includes audio and video communication [0026].

Elms in view of Chack does not explicitly teach that said audio and video communication over the Internet includes video conferencing.

Walker et al. (Walker) teaches a method and system for providing to a prospective customer a reference for a merchant, wherein communication between parties is enabled via video conferencing, instant messaging or e-mail [0091].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Elms in view of Chack to include video conferencing, as disclosed in Walker, because it would advantageously allow parties to see each other during said communication, thereby creating more relaxed and trustworthy environment for conducting business transaction.

As per claims 6, 16 and 23, Elms teaches providing the real-time chat over the Internet in written format between the parties [0070].

As per claims 25-27, Walker teaches providing video conferencing between the parties, thereby indicating providing voice and video communication. The motivation to combine Elms with Walker would be to advantageously allow parties to see each other

Art Unit: 3628

during said communication, thereby creating more relaxed and trustworthy environment for conducting business transaction.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-27, 30 and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Igor Borissov whose telephone number is 571-272-6801. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Igor N. Borissov/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628